



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,154	09/23/2003	Avram Scheiner	279.608US1	1665

21186 7590 08/17/2006

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 2938  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
----------

HELLER, TAMMIE K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3766

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/669,154	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHEINER, AVRAM	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tammie Heller	<b>Art Unit</b> 3766	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-13 and 15-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-13 and 15-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed on June 27, 2006 has been received and considered. By this amendment, claims 1, 7-11, and 15-17 have been amended, claims 4 and 14 have been cancelled, and claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-17 are now pending in the application.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 27, 2006 regarding the rejections of claims 1-17 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Casavant, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Casavant fails to disclose monitoring respiratory activity while an output capacitor is charging or delivering diaphragmatic pacing if respiratory arrest is detected and the output capacitor has not finished charging. Specifically, at page 7, ln. 8-11, of the response, Applicant concedes that the Casavant reference discusses delivering phrenic nerve stimulation while an output capacitor is charging, but fails to suggest monitoring respiratory activity. At paragraph 34, Casavant discloses that stimulation is applied to the phrenic nerves in order to facilitate a more normal respiration pattern. Therefore, the Examiner takes the position that the apparatus of Casavant inherently detects respiratory activity in order to determine the rate and level of the phrenic nerve stimulation (see paragraph 73 and 74). At Figure 5, Casavant discloses delivering diaphragmatic pacing if respiratory arrest is detected and the output capacitor has not finished charging (see steps 246 and 248).

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Casavant et al. (U.S. 2004/0088015), herein Casavant. Regarding claim 1, Casavant discloses an implantable medical device for diaphragmatic stimulation which includes ventricular sensing and shock channels (see paragraph 28, ln. 4-10 and paragraph 48, ln. 12-14), a controller 114 (see paragraph 6, ln. 1-3 and paragraph 57, ln. 1-4), and thoracic impedance and diaphragmatic pacing channels (see paragraph 16 and paragraph 48, ln. 12-14). Further, the controller of Casavant is programmed to begins charging an output capacitor of the ventricular shock channel when ventricular fibrillation is detected, deliver diaphragmatic pacing if respiratory arrest is detected and only if the output capacitor has not finished charging, and deliver a shock pulse after the output capacitor is charged (see Figure 5). At paragraph 34, Casavant discloses that stimulation is applied to the phrenic nerves in order to facilitate a more normal respiration pattern. Therefore, the Examiner takes the position that the apparatus of Casavant inherently detects respiratory activity in order to determine the rate and level of the phrenic nerve stimulation (see paragraph 73 and 74).

Art Unit: 3766

6. Regarding claim 2, Casavant discloses that the diaphragmatic pacing channel may also be used to deliver cardiac pacing pulses (see paragraph 48, ln. 11-12).

7. Regarding claim 3, Casavant discloses that the diaphragmatic pacing pulses may be applied at an amplitude of 20 volts (see paragraph 59, ln. 9-10), which is within the range of 10 to 30 volts.

8. Regarding claim 5, Casavant discloses a feedback loop in Figure 5 that determines whether one or more shock pulses applied to the heart result in a termination of the ventricular fibrillation. If the fibrillation is still detected, the device of Casavant evaluates whether shock or pacing is required and delivers the specified therapy. Diaphragmatic pacing pulses are applied if it is determined that a previous shock pulse failed to terminate the ventricular fibrillation (see Figure 5).

9. Regarding claim 6, Casavant discloses that a diaphragmatic pacing pulse may be delivered during a ventricular refractory period of a ventricular sense (see paragraph 36, ln. 16-19).

10. Regarding claim 7, as previously discussed, at paragraph 34, Casavant discloses that stimulation is applied to the phrenic nerves in order to facilitate a more normal respiration pattern. Therefore, the Examiner takes the position that the controller of Casavant is inherently programmed to monitor for respiratory activity after successful termination of the ventricular fibrillation by the shock pulse in order to determine the rate and level of the phrenic nerve stimulation (see paragraph 73 and 74). Further, Casavant discloses that a diaphragmatic pacing pulse may be delivered during a ventricular refractory period of a ventricular sense (see paragraph 36, ln. 16-19).

11. Regarding claim 8, Casavant discloses an implantable medical device for diaphragmatic stimulation which includes ventricular sensing and shock channels (see paragraph 28, ln. 4-10 and paragraph 48, ln. 12-14), a controller 114 (see paragraph 6, ln. 1-3 and paragraph 57, ln. 1-4), and thoracic impedance and diaphragmatic pacing channels (see paragraph 16 and paragraph 48, ln. 12-14). Further, the controller of Casavant is programmed to begins charging an output capacitor of the ventricular shock channel when ventricular fibrillation is detected, deliver diaphragmatic pacing if respiratory arrest is detected and only if the output capacitor has not finished charging, and deliver a shock pulse after the output capacitor is charged (see Figure 5). At paragraph 34, Casavant discloses that stimulation is applied to the phrenic nerves in order to facilitate a more normal respiration pattern. Therefore, the Examiner takes the position that the apparatus of Casavant inherently detects respiratory activity in order to determine the rate and level of the phrenic nerve stimulation (see paragraph 73 and 74).

12. Regarding claim 9, as previously discussed, at paragraph 34, Casavant discloses that stimulation is applied to the phrenic nerves in order to facilitate a more normal respiration pattern. Therefore, the Examiner takes the position that the controller of Casavant is inherently programmed to monitor for respiratory activity after successful termination of the ventricular fibrillation by the shock pulse in order to determine the rate and level of the phrenic nerve stimulation (see paragraph 73 and 74). Further, Casavant discloses that a diaphragmatic pacing pulse may be delivered during a ventricular refractory period of a ventricular sense (see paragraph 36, ln. 16-19).

13. Regarding claim 10, Casavant discloses a feedback loop in Figure 5 that determines whether one or more shock pulses applied to the heart result in a termination of the ventricular fibrillation. If the fibrillation is still detected, the device of Casavant evaluates whether shock or pacing is required and delivers the specified therapy. Diaphragmatic pacing pulses are applied if it is determined that a previous shock pulse failed to terminate the ventricular fibrillation (see Figure 5).

14. Regarding claim 11, Casavant discloses an implantable medical device that performs the method of monitoring a ventricular sensing channel in order to detect ventricular fibrillation (see paragraph 28, ln. 4-10 and paragraph 48, ln. 12-14), begin charging an output capacitor of the ventricular shock channel when ventricular fibrillation is detected (see step 244 in Figure 5), delivering diaphragmatic pacing upon detection of respiratory arrest only if the output capacitor is not finished charging (see step 246 in Figure 5), and delivering shock therapy through a ventricular shock channel after the output capacitor has charged (see step 250 in Figure 5). At paragraph 34, Casavant discloses that stimulation is applied to the phrenic nerves in order to facilitate a more normal respiration pattern. Therefore, the Examiner takes the position that the apparatus of Casavant inherently detects respiratory activity in order to determine the rate and level of the phrenic nerve stimulation (see paragraph 73 and 74).

15. Regarding claim 12, Casavant discloses that the diaphragmatic pacing is delivered as pacing pulses to the phrenic nerve (see paragraph 36, ln. 16-19).

16. Regarding claim 13, Casavant discloses that the diaphragmatic pacing pulses may be applied at an amplitude of 20 volts (see paragraph 59, ln. 9-10), which is within the range of 10 to 30 volts.

17. Regarding claim 15, Casavant discloses a feedback loop in Figure 5 that determines whether one or more shock pulses applied to the heart result in a termination of the ventricular fibrillation. If the fibrillation is still detected, the device of Casavant evaluates whether shock or pacing is required and delivers the specified therapy. Diaphragmatic pacing pulses are applied if it is determined that a previous shock pulse failed to terminate the ventricular fibrillation (see Figure 5).

18. Regarding claim 16, Casavant discloses delivering diaphragmatic pacing through a cardiac pacing channel (see Figure 1).

19. Regarding claim 17, as previously discussed, at paragraph 34, Casavant discloses that stimulation is applied to the phrenic nerves in order to facilitate a more normal respiration pattern. Therefore, the Examiner takes the position that the controller of Casavant is inherently programmed to monitor for respiratory activity after successful termination of the ventricular fibrillation by the shock pulse in order to determine the rate and level of the phrenic nerve stimulation (see paragraph 73 and 74). Further, Casavant discloses that a diaphragmatic pacing pulse may be delivered during a ventricular refractory period of a ventricular sense (see paragraph 36, ln. 16-19).



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheiner in view of Min et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,976, cited by applicant), herein Min. Regarding claims 1, 8, and 11, Scheiner discloses a method and apparatus for diaphragmatic pacing which includes ventricular sensing and shock channels (see col. 3, ln. 59-60 and col. 4, ln. 3-7), a controller (see col. 5, ln. 63-67 and col. 6, ln. 1-3), and thoracic impedance and diaphragmatic pacing channels (see col. 5, ln. 65-67 and col. 6, ln. 1-3). Further, the controller of Scheiner is programmed to deliver a shock pulse when ventricular fibrillation is detected and deliver a diaphragmatic pacing pulse when no respiratory activity is detected (see col. 6, ln. 9-14 and 19-21). Scheiner fails to disclose charging an output capacitor when ventricular fibrillation is detected, monitoring respiratory activity while the output capacitor is charging, delivering diaphragmatic stimulation if respiratory arrest is detected and only if the output capacitor has not finished charging, and delivering a shock pulse after the output capacitor is charged. Min discloses a system while correlates the delivery of a cardioversion therapy to an optimum phase of the respiratory cycle which includes a controller which charges an output capacitor when ventricular fibrillation is detected, monitors respiratory activity while the output capacitor is charging, delivers

diaphragmatic stimulation if respiratory arrest is detected and only if the output capacitor has not finished charging, and delivers a shock pulse after the output capacitor is charged (see col. 6, ln. 9-22). The controller of Min is utilized in order to effect delivery of therapy when the impedance between the stimulation electrodes is minimized (see col. 1, ln. 28-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the controller and control steps taught by Min, in the method and apparatus of Scheiner, in order to effect delivery of therapy when the impedance between the stimulation electrodes is minimized.

22. Regarding claim 2, Scheiner discloses that the diaphragmatic pacing channel may also be used to deliver cardiac pacing pulses (see col. 4, ln. 7-9).

23. Regarding claims 3 and 13, Scheiner discloses that the diaphragmatic pacing pulse is on the order of 0.2 to 14 volts (see col. 4, ln. 62-65), which is within the range of 10 to 30 volts.

24. Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, the control steps taught by Min include delivering a diaphragmatic pacing pulse when both respiratory arrest and ventricular fibrillation are detected only after one or more shock pulses are unsuccessful in termination the ventricular fibrillation (see Figure 5).

25. Regarding claim 6, Scheiner discloses that a diaphragmatic pacing pulse may be delivered during a ventricular refractory period after a ventricular sense (see col. 9, ln. 29-30).

26. Regarding claims 7, 9, and 17, Scheiner illustrates in Figure 7 that a diaphragmatic pacing pulse may be delivered during ventricular fibrillation while the

device prepares to deliver a shock pulse. Further, the control steps taught by Min include monitoring for respiratory activity after successful termination of the ventricular fibrillation by the shock pulse and delivering a diaphragmatic pacing pulse during a ventricular refractory period after a ventricular sense if respiratory arrest is detected.

27. Regarding claim 12, Scheiner discloses that the diaphragmatic pacing is delivered as pacing pulses to the phrenic nerve (see col. 3, ln. 43).

28. Regarding claim 16, Scheiner discloses delivering diaphragmatic pacing through a cardiac pacing channel (see Figures 1A and 1B).

### ***Conclusion***

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammie Heller whose telephone number is 571-272-1986. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7am until 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tammie K. Heller  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3766

TKH



Robert E. Pezzuto  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3766